

REMARKS

Claims 1-57 were pending in the present application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 20 and 39. Claims 1-57 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

The Examiner objected to the title of the application as not descriptive. Applicants respectfully disagree. The titles suggested by the Examiner are both too narrow and misdescriptive of the invention. The current title, "Object-Level Access Control for CORBA Gateway", is an appropriate title, especially in light of the claim amendments presented herein. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the title.

The Examiner objected to the abstract of the application. The abstract has been amended to overcome the Examiner's objections.

The Examiner objected to Figures 1a, 1b and 2 as needing a "Prior Art" legend. Applicants have amended Fig. 1a as requested by the Examiner, but maintain that Figs. 1b and 2 are distinct from prior art, as described by the specification. Specifically, Fig. 1b illustrates a computer system configured to implement various aspects of the invention. While the invention may be implemented on prior art computer hardware, Fig. 1b represents a computer configured to implement one or more aspects of the invention, and thus does not represent the prior art. If Fig. 1b was labeled as "Prior Art", it would imply that the description of Fig. 1b is also prior art, which is not the case. In order to avoid this confusion, Applicants assert that Fig. 1b should not be labeled as prior art. Likewise, Fig. 2 is an illustration of a CORBA gateway to an enterprise manager according to one embodiment of the invention, as described in the application, and is clearly not prior art.

Section 102(e) Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 1-57 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Barker et al. (U.S. Patent 6,363,421) (hereinafter “Barker”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Barker does not teach a gateway that is configurable to provide object-level access control between the managers and the managed objects to receive the events from or to send the requests to the managed objects, as recited in claim 1. At col. 8, lines 31-54, Barker only mentions basic server authentication and SSL. Barker does not teach object-level access control between the managers and the managed objects. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Barker.

Similarly, in regard to independent claims 20 and 39, Barker does not teach determining on a managed object level whether or not the manager application is allowed to receive an event generated by a managed object or to send a request to the managed object as a function of the identity of the user of the manager application, whereby access for the manager application to receive the event or send the request is approved or denied for the managed object, and delivering the event to the manager application or the request to the managed object if the manager access is approved.

Applicants also assert that numerous one of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the independent claims have been shown to be patentably distinct, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not required at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is requested.

If any extension of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicants hereby petition for such extension. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5181-48400/RCK.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- Return Receipt Postcard
- Petition for Extension of Time
- Replacement Drawing Sheet for Fig. 1b
- Notice of Change of Address
- Fee Authorization Form authorizing a deposit account debit in the amount of \$ for fees ().
- Other:

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Kowert
Reg. No. 39,255
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: September 26, 2003